

DRAFT

**Liquefied Natural Gas Task Force
Meeting Summary
October 4, 2006**

Introductions and agreement on meeting agenda

Dr. Baker opened the meeting by greeting everyone, asking all attendees to introduce themselves.

After introductions, Dr. Baker noted that the agenda had been modified slightly to allow the three Committees to meet individually during the afternoon, and asked if there were any other suggested changes to the agenda, of which there were none.

Approval of the Meeting Summary

Summary of the September 5 meeting was approved.

Introductory discussions

Dr. Baker reminded everyone to check the MDE website for frequent updates and information for the Task Force.

Dr. Baker made the following introductory remarks:

1. He appreciates everyone's enthusiasm.
2. He reminded the Task Force that our objective is to report to the Legislature and Governor, and provide them guidance on the issue. The Task Force needs to continually remind itself of that objective.
3. The Task Force is here to represent the citizens of the State.
4. Much of what the Task Force will discuss revolves around issues of jurisdiction, and who has authority over which issues.
5. All Task Force meetings are open meetings.
6. Committee meetings are also open meetings, but this is by decision of the Task Force, and is not required. Interested parties may listen, but not participate in Committee meetings unless invited to do so. If an interested party would like to provide comments or information to a Committee, they may do so in writing or via a Task Force member.

Mr. Jackson commented that he was very concerned about the tone at the September 5 Task Force meeting. In particular, he was concerned that his comments, and the comments of other citizen Task Force members were not being taken seriously. Mr. Thiess echoed Mr. Jackson's comments.

Ms. Beazley stated that the community has learned much from Mr. Jackson's knowledge, and urged him to continue to participate. Dr. Baker requested that Mr. Jackson put his concerns in writing and submit them to the Task Force. Mr. Jackson indicated that he would do so.

Progress and challenges from Environmental Impacts Committee

Dr. Baker reviewed progress of the Environmental Impacts Committee as detailed in the handout, "Environmental Impacts Committee: Summary of Conference Call on Sept. 20, 2006."

Mr. Rice asked if Dr. Baker was intending to conduct an analysis of the toxicity of the dredge material from the site. Dr. Baker replied that there was insufficient time and money to conduct such an analysis, but that there would be an evaluation of the available data.

Progress and challenges from the Risk and Safety Committee

Mr. Dawson reviewed progress of the Risk and Safety Committee as detailed in their notes from the forthcoming "Risk and Safety Committee: Summary of Conference Call on October 2, 2006" (to be submitted for publication on the MDE website pending final approval of Committee).

Mr. Jackson expressed concerns about how the communities would be evacuated in the case of an emergency. Mr. Thiess added concerns about how the potential construction of an ethanol plant near the proposed LNG facility would further complicate evacuation plans, and asked about the status of the Key Bridge and who is responsible for making decisions on whether or not that would be closed. Mr. Brooks suggested looking at how Cove Point LNG facility, and other LNG facilities around the world respond to such situations.

Land Use: Discussion of key questions

Mr. Brooks stated that the Committee primarily reviewed AES Resource Reports #5 and #8.

Mr. Brooks provided four handouts to the Task Force. His presentation summarized the contents of the handout, "Land Use Subcommittee: Questions/Issues Raised by Resource Reports" (dated October 4, 2006). Mr. Brooks referred to a poster of the Baltimore County Zoning plan as well as the other three handouts throughout his presentation.

Ms. Beazley reported that it is her understanding that certain HUD authorities regarding the proximity of LNG facilities to residences may supersede FERC authority to license

LNG plants in certain areas. Ms. Beazley indicated that she will provide this documentation to the Task Force.

Working lunch: discussion of video availability

Dr. Baker introduced the lunchtime discussion by explaining that anything presented to the Task Force needs to be made available to the public. The problem is that AES would like to submit a rebuttal of the Riley video into the record, but, due to copyright laws, the Task Force cannot submit the Riley video (*The Risks and Dangers of LNG*) itself for free public viewing.

After much discussion, the decision of the Task Force was:

1. Publish on the MDE website the information necessary for someone to access the video, with the understanding that they would have to pay in order to watch it. Pending publication of this information, the AES rebuttal would also be published on the MDE website, and
2. That the full Task Force would view the video over lunch, which was then done.

Break out groups for all committees

Dr. Baker charged the three committees with trying to make distinctions between “findings” and “recommendations”

All three committees and interested parties then met individually for approximately 1 hour.

Reports - Summary

- Geophysical impacts on channels
- Consistency with existing plans
- Impact of project on Coastal Zone
- Possible presentations at next meeting
 - FERC
 - Coast Guard (Process for decision making)
 - MEMA/Baltimore County Fire Dept – Emergency Response capabilities
 - Baltimore County Planning – how project fits with plans

Organization of Report

Dr. Baker suggested that each Committee should strive to produce a brief report (few pages) divided into two primary sections:

1. Findings (e.g., needed information is not available)
2. Recommendations (e.g., that information needs to be obtained)

There was also discussion of whether the final report would be simply three separate committee reports compiled into one, or would there be an effort to compile the three committee reports into one unified report from the Task Force. Given the high likelihood of overlap on certain issues between the three committees, the decision was to compile the three committee reports into one, unified report from the Task Force.

There was also discussion of whether a draft of the final report should be placed on the website for public review and comment prior to submission to the Legislature and Governor. The decision was not to submit the report for public review and comment, but rather directly to the Legislature and Governor.